

Socratic Learning: Empowering the Generative Model

Paroma Varma^{*1}, Rose Yu^{*2}, Dan Iter¹, Christopher De Sa¹, and Christopher Ré¹

¹Stanford University ²University of Southern California
{paroma,daniter,cdesa}@stanford.edu,qiyu@usc.edu,chrismre@cs.stanford.edu

November 10, 2016

Abstract

Modern machine learning techniques often use discriminative models that require large amounts of labeled data. Since generating labeled training data sets is expensive, an alternative approach is to use a generative model, which usually leverages a simple heuristic to *weakly* label data. Domain experts prefer to use generative models because they “tell a story” about their data. Unfortunately, generative models are typically less accurate than discriminative models. Several recent approaches connect the two types of models to exploit their strengths. In this setting, a misspecified generative model can hurt the performance of subsequent discriminative training. To address this issue, we propose a framework called *Socratic learning* that automatically uses information from the discriminative model to correct generative model misspecification. This process also provides users with interpretable feedback about how to manually improve their generative model. We evaluate Socratic learning on real-world relation extraction, crowdsourcing and multi-modal classification tasks and observe an automatic improvement in classification accuracy that could otherwise require a significant amount of effort on the users’ part.

1 Introduction

Supervised learning methods such deep learning have gained major success due to the availability of large training sets and automated feature engineering. However, for many machine learning applications, large amounts of training data are difficult to obtain. In such cases, distant supervision approaches have been used to generate a *weakly* labeled training set, where a generative model in the form of a simple heuristic or external knowledge base is used to apply labels to data points. The recently proposed data programming [9] paradigm extends this idea by incorporating user-defined heuristics called *labeling functions* in the generative model. This allows for the programmatic labeling of data to create a large but noisy training set. Users often prefer generative models since they are able to encode domain knowledge through easily explainable rules while discriminative models are more powerful since they have access to the features of the data. Therefore, using the noisy labels from the generative model to train a discriminative model for the desired task takes advantage of the strengths of both kinds of models.

There are two underlying issues with the above approach. First, the generative model may be misspecified, which can affect subsequent discriminative training. Such a weak generative model may result from labeling processes that are too general, not accurate enough, or do not have high coverage. Second, the errors in the generative model provide users with little intuition about what went wrong and how it can be fixed. In both cases, there is no methodical approach for identifying and “debugging” the model misspecification issue. Users instead spend most of their time manually investigating the reason for the labeling process’ poor performance and revising the generative model without much direction.

In this paper, we propose the framework of *Socratic learning*, an iterative process that *systematically* improves the generative model by using information from the discriminative model. Since the discriminative

^{*}authors contributed equally to this work

model is more powerful than the generative model, it can pass critical knowledge to the generative model to make it more precise and expressive when assigning labels to the training data. This information transfer is performed via features that are easily interpretable and provide users feedback about how they can write more effective labeling functions. Once these features are identified, they are incorporated into the generative model to improve its accuracy.

The trade-off between explainable and high-performing machine learning models is a growing concern when designing Explainable AI models [1]. In Socratic learning, the generative model improves by discovering hidden classes in the data via features that the discriminative model has access to. This process is transparent since the user can see exactly what information is being passed from the discriminative to the generative model and how it affects the accuracy of the latter. For example, with a bag-of-words feature representation, the identified feature would be a phrase that points to some underlying bias in the data and the generative model. With these easily explainable features, the user has the opportunity to recognize why the model is behaving poorly and to improve it manually as well.

Summary of Contributions and Outline Our first contribution is the *Socratic learning* framework, which addresses the model misspecification issue in distant supervision by enabling knowledge transfer between generative and discriminative models. In Section 3, we outline a specific distant supervision setting and describe how Socratic learning improves that pipeline by adding a feedback loop in the process. In Section 4, we demonstrate that Socratic learning is able to pick out the relevant features and improve the accuracy of the generative and discriminative models on synthetic data.

We further validate our claims experimentally on real-world data sets related to text relation extraction, crowdsourcing for sentiment analysis and multimodal (image and text) classification tasks. We compare against a simple majority vote across labeling functions and the data programming paradigm. For a disease mention extraction task, we show an average 2.04 point and 0.95 point F1 score improvement over taking majority vote and data programming, respectively. For a sentiment analysis task using crowdsourcing, we show a 8.11 point and a 2.7 point accuracy score improvement over the data programming and neural network approach. Finally, we define an image classification task where we show an improvement of 3.04 point and 1.07 point over majority vote and data programming. Moreover, we also demonstrate that the feedback Socratic learning provides in the form of features is indeed interpretable by users in the above cases by conforming with domain experts who wrote the labeling functions.

2 Related Work

Socratic learning is based on the concept of distant supervision [7, 11] where the labels are generated by a set of heuristic labeling functions. A canonical example of distant supervision is information extraction from text where set membership in the dictionaries of ontologies is used as labeling functions. Data programming Ratner et al. [9] proposes a paradigm to identify the noisy patterns of labeling functions written with the DDLite framework [2] to generate labeled data. Socratic learning goes beyond data programming by identifying the important feature dependencies that might have been missed by the generative process.

In the semi-supervised learning literature, common methods use generative models such as Bayes nets, mixture models [15], and deep neural networks [4] to train on the unlabeled data. Pseudo-Label [5] proposes to generate *Pseudo-Labels* by picking up the class that has maximum predicted probability for each unlabeled data point. The Generative Adversarial Network (GAN) [3] proposes a novel strategy for estimating generative models by simultaneously training two models. In contrast, we do not focus on semi-supervised learning. Instead, we address the model misspecification issue of existing frameworks.

Our work is also related to learning from noisy labels. For example, Xiao et al. [13] proposes a generative approach to train CNNs with a few clean labels and numerous noisy labels. Specifically, they develop a probabilistic model to describe the generative process of the noisy labels. Reed et al. [10] avoids directly modeling the noise distribution via a bootstrapping approach, where they use a convex combination of noisy labels and the current model’s prediction to generate the training targets. Our method, however, does not require any ground truth labels. We learn the noise in the labels following a maximum entropy principal.

There is growing interest in improving the interpretability of machine learning models. Recent work focuses on making aspects of machine learning more interactive by including the user in the automated labeling [2] and feature selection [14] processes. Marco Túlio Ribeiro [6] proposes using a locally weighted

linear classifier to explain the decision boundaries of complicated models. In our case, the interpretability comes directly from the features of the data, which are easily deciphered in most cases. Moreover, Socratic learning does not sacrifice accuracy; instead, it improves the generative model while making this process more easily understandable for the user.

3 Methodology

We describe a distant supervision paradigm in which our methods apply and show how Socratic learning operates in this setting. Our goal is to construct a simple and efficient pipeline where we can leverage the discriminative model to programmatically “debug” the heuristic rules or labeling processes that make up the generative model.

3.1 Problem Setting

In this paper, we focus on the setting of binary classification problems in which we are concerned with a population of objects $\mathcal{O}$, where each object $o \in \mathcal{O}$ is assigned:

- a hidden true label $Y(o) \in \{-1, 1\}$;
- a vector of R features $X(o) \in \{-1, 1\}^R$; and
- a family of M labeling functions $\Lambda(o) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^M$, each of which encodes a noisy or *weak* guess for the true label $Y(o)$.

We are given a set of N training examples $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{O}$, and have access to their features and labeling functions—but not their true label. Our goal is to output a classifier that accurately estimates Y .

This setting, which was introduced in [9], differs from the standard supervised learning setting in that, rather than having access to the true labels for training, we need to use the noisy *labeling functions* as heuristics. It differs from the general weakly supervised setting in that we have no access to ground truth for any examples at training time.

3.2 Learning with Generative and Discriminative Models

The absence of ground truth during training means that a standard discriminative technique, such as logistic regression, cannot be naively applied in this setting. However, there are many cases where there is a particular discriminative model that we want to train because it has performed well for similar problems when labeled training data were available.

The recently proposed data programming paradigm [9] handles such cases by learning a generative model that uses labeling functions to *predict* the labels for the training examples. These noisy predicted labels Y_G are used in conjunction with the features X to train the discriminative model. The discriminative model outputs a classifier $Y_D : \{-1, 1\}^R \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$ and can generalize this mapping over all objects, including those not labeled by the labeling functions. This information flow from the generative to the discriminative model is described in Figure 1a.

We look at the case in which the generative model, G , is represented as a factor graph as described in data programming. The generative model uses a distribution in the following family to describe the relationship between the labeling functions Λ and the true class Y :

$$\pi_\phi(\Lambda, Y) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp(\phi^T \Lambda Y) \quad (1)$$

where Z is a partition function to ensure π outputs a distribution. Data programming learns the parameter $\phi \in \mathbb{R}^M$ by maximizing the marginal likelihood of the observed labeling functions Λ . Once it learns ϕ , it can assign predicted labels, in the form of marginal likelihoods, by computing $\pi_\phi(Y|\Lambda(o))$ for each object o in the training set.

The discriminative model D minimizes the noise-aware empirical risk [9] given the features X of the data and the marginals from the generative model.

$$L_\phi(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{(\Lambda, Y) \sim \pi_\phi} [\log(1 + \exp(-\theta^T XY)) | \Lambda] \quad (2)$$




Figure 1: The solid arrows represent the flow of information in the data programming pipeline and the dashed arrows refer to the Socratic learning feedback loop.

Since the above is a logistic regression problem, it can be solved via gradient descent. Moreover, within this framework, we can convert any discriminative model to be noise-aware by modifying its loss function as above.

3.3 Generative Model Misspecification

When writing labeling functions in the data programming setting or hand-labeling data points in the crowd-sourcing setting, it is unlikely that these labeling processes perform uniformly over the entire dataset. Each labeling function might have a higher accuracy for a certain subset of the data compared to the rest. If critical information that relates such latent classes in the data to these heuristics are overlooked, it can lead to an under-specified generative model.




Figure 2: Toy example of a labeling function has different accuracies for different subsets of the data, described using the feature X_d .

Consider the example in Figure 2. The labeling function shown has an accuracy of 75% over the entire dataset, which is what the factor graph model in Equation 1 would ideally learn. However, there can be natural partitions in the data where the labeling functions might have very distinct performances. In this case, the labeling function is highly accurate for some portion of the data and should be trusted more in that region than it's average accuracy. This observation suggests that if the generative model takes into account such biases in the labeling functions, it could learn more fine-grained accuracies for the heuristics, therefore improving its overall performance.

3.4 Socratic Learning

If the generative model wants to learn these latent classes in the data, it needs access to some additional information that describes these partitions. It is important to note that these hidden classes are not likely to be random but instead depend on some underlying characteristic of the data itself — characteristics that are encoded by the features of the data. Therefore, we can assume that these latent classes in the data can be identified by some features $X_S \subset X$, as shown in Figure 2.

Algorithm 1 Socratic Learning

- 1: **Input:** labeling function $\Lambda \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^{M \times N}$, $X \in \{-1, 1\}^{R \times N}$
 - 2: $X_S = \emptyset$
 - 3: **repeat**
 - 4: Learn generative model $G(\Lambda, X_S, Y)$ and compute labels Y_G
 - 5: Learn discriminative model $D(Y|X)$ and compute labels Y_D
 - 6: Compute disagreement $V = -Y_G Y_D$
 - 7: Select features X_S that are most indicative of V
 - 8: **until** performance stops improving
-

Socratic learning initializes with a simple generative model from Equation 1, which could be misspecified. It then uses the predictions from the generative and discriminative models, Y_G and Y_D to compute the disagreement of the two models $V = -Y_G Y_D$. The difference model finds the features X_S that are most indicative of the disagreement V via ℓ_1 regularized logistic regression. Finally, it passes these features into the generative model. This feedback loop is shown in Figure 1b.

The factor graph model described in Equation 1 does not take into account any hidden effect the features might have on the generative model. Socratic learning jointly models the relationship between the labeling functions, the true class, and the important features X_S via the factor graph:

$$\pi_{\phi, \mathbf{W}}(\Lambda, Y, X_S) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp(\phi^T \Lambda Y + (\mathbf{W} X_S)^T \Lambda Y) \quad (3)$$

In the above equation, X_S represents the $K \ll R$ features that the generative model depends on. $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times K}$ are additional weights for the labeling functions that quantify the effect of these features on π . It encodes the *difference* from the uniform accuracy described by ϕ each labeling function has when conditioned on features X_S . These new weights $\mathbf{W}$ are also learned via maximum likelihood estimation.

Socratic learning iteratively identifies the features that, when included in the generative model, would improve it. It refines the generative model by updating the set of features X_S . As more features are added to the generative model, the risk of overfitting to the training set increases. Adding in all the features ($R = K$) to the generative model would lead the model to fit more parameters than data points in most real-world examples where $N < R \times M$. Since the model parameters should not be changed by looking at the test set performance, an additional hold-out validation set is used to track the accuracy of the generative model. As soon as the performance on this validation set drops, the Socratic learning process is stopped. This iterative procedure is described in Algorithm 1. Moreover, since users also receive interpretable feedback in the form of the features X_S , they can manually improve the generative model by writing additional labeling functions.

4 Experimental Results

We explore the following claims about the Socratic learning approach. First, we demonstrate that passing information from the discriminative to the generative model improves the expressiveness of the generative model, which leads to an improvement in the accuracy of both models. Second, the features that Socratic learning identifies to encode this information are easily interpretable and provide users intuition about why their model is lacking. Finally, we show that Socratic learning can be used in different settings with a variety of discriminative models and report its performance on a real world text relation extraction task, a crowdsourcing task, and a multimodal image classification task.

4.1 Synthetic Experiments

We ran synthetic experiments with 10 labeling functions with random accuracies ranging between 0.5 and 0.75 and coverage of 0.4. We generated 40 features that were correlated with the true class (the feature fired 85% of the time when the true label was 1). One feature was highly correlated with labeling function *accuracy*, i.e. the feature fired when the labeling function it corresponded to applied the correct label to an object 95% of the time. Figure 3 shows how often the correct feature is identified by the difference model. In order to explore the improvement in the generative and discriminative model, we modified the setup to now include 3 features that were highly correlated to 3 different labeling function accuracies. Figure 4a shows

the F1 scores of the generative and discriminative models. The baseline (Features Added = 0) refers to using the data programming paradigm with its noise-aware logistic regression as the discriminative model, which performs logistic regression given the marginals for the training data instead of hard labels. The discriminative F1 score is evaluated on the test set while the generative accuracy is evaluated on the held out validation set. The plot shows that Socratic learning leads to an improvement in both models until 3 features are added. After this point, the features identified do not have any relation to the accuracies of the labeling functions, and this additional information causes the accuracy of both models to drop.




Figure 3: Simulation results to show probability with which the difference model picks out the right feature.

Baselines For the experimental tasks, we compare our performance against (1) fully supervised (FS), (2) majority vote (MV), (3) data programming (DP) and (4) neural network (NN) accuracy scores. FS is the only baseline that uses the true labels for training. MV uses majority vote across all labeling functions and DP uses the data programming paradigm [9] without considering features in the generative model. NN replaces the logistic regression discriminative model in DP with a neural network, keeping the generative model the same.

4.2 Relation Extraction from Text

In the general relation extraction setting, we are given a set of candidates, which are substrings of a sentence, and the goal is to classify whether those candidates are in a given relationship. We use the data from the BioCreative CDR Challenge Wei et al. [12], where mentions of diseases are extracted from PubMed abstracts and the labeling functions are written by a team of domain experts. Table 1 displays the performance of different methods with two sets of labeling functions. Disease Tagging-32 uses 32 heavily engineered labeling functions, which suggests that any underlying biases that might have been present in the first few iterations of writing these functions were eventually alleviated. As expected, Socratic learning does not show much improvement in this case.

Disease Tagging-16 uses labeling functions that rely only on using dictionaries and regex rules. These labeling functions tend to either be more noisy or have lower coverage than the extensively hand-tuned labeling functions. Here, Socratic learning is able to increase the F1 score by 0.95 points, on average, compared to the data programming approach — an improvement which could otherwise require weeks of effort by a domain expert. This iterative improvement is shown in Figure 4b.

The feedback that improves the Disease Tagging-16 consists of the feature that represents the presence of the phrase “for induction of...”. Socratic learning finds that it is negatively correlated with the accuracy of labeling function *non-common diseases*, which works by searching through a dictionary of predefined non-common diseases such as anesthesia and pregnancy and returns a -1 if it finds a match. Phrases like “for induction of anesthesia” show up a fair amount in a Google/PubMed query, which does not indicate a true negative disease relation. This serves as a reminder for users to consider the presence of “for induction of...” and other such common phrases when designing the labeling function *non-common diseases*. It is important to note that having access to this feature provides users an easier path to debugging and improving their generative model since they can manually add labeling functions that are aware of such situations.

Application	# of LFs	Baseline			Socratic Learning	
		FS	MV	DP	1F	3F
Disease Tagging-32	32	86.47	84.42	85.28	85.30	85.29
Disease Tagging-16	16	86.47	77.98	79.07	79.18	80.02

Table 1: F1 scores for Socratic Learning and baseline methods noise-aware logistic regression as the discriminative model. k -F refers to adding k features to the generative model.




Figure 4: Improvement in F1 Score for generative and discriminative models with addition of features. Best improvement is achieved at 3 features in both scenarios.

4.3 Crowdsourcing

In this setting, we used the Airline Twitter Sentiment analysis data¹. The task at hand is to classify tweets related to airlines as “Positive” or “Negative”. In this scenario, each of the 320 workers who labeled the dataset were treated like labeling processes. Each object was a tweet that was converted to a feature representation using a simple bag-of-words scheme (1- and 2-gram). These sparse features are fed directly into the feed forward network. We use a two layer dense network with dropout, ReLU activation for the first layer and binary cross entropy loss.

Table 2 shows how data programming performs significantly better than majority vote and how replacing the noise-aware logistic regression with a simple 2-layer neural network builds on that improvement significantly. With the addition of Socratic learning, the performance jumps another 2.7 points, on average. There is no score under FS since the training data in this case did not have ground truth labels and a model could not be trained with these ground truth labels.

The first feature that leads to an improvement in the generative model represents the phrase “arrived early”, which boosts the accuracy of most workers. This makes sense since positive phrases like these are easy for people to identify. The workers who label these points can be trusted more when this phrase occurs in the tweet. Even in this crowdsourcing setting, this feature can further lend to designing labeling functions that automatically label anything with words like “early” as “Positive”. Since this paradigm allows for the mix of manual and automatic labeling processes, one can imagine improving the generative model in this case by adding programmatic labeling functions to the existing labels provided by humans.

4.4 Image Classification

MS-COCO² is an image recognition dataset, where each image is associated with five captions describing its content. We define our task as classifying each image as that of a person or object (not one of the challenges associated with this dataset). We wrote a small number of labeling functions that operated on the captions. For example, one of the labeling functions returns a label of “person” for the image if the word “man” or “woman” appears anywhere in the captions.

We use transfer learning [8] with the AlexNet neural network trained on the ImageNet training set and

¹<https://www.crowdflower.com/data/airline-twitter-sentiment/>

²<http://mscoco.org/>

Application	# of LFs	Baseline				Socratic Learning	
		FS	MV	DP	NN	1F	2F
Twitter	320	NA	70.26	75.67	81.08	83.78	81.08
MS-COCO	3	67.09	54.05	NA	56.12	56.26	57.19

Table 2: Accuracy scores for Socratic Learning and baseline methods. k -F refers to adding k features to the generative model. Note that the accuracies for MS-COCO are relatively low compared to state-of-the-art methods since the neural network used is not meant for binary image classification.

only tune the final layer. The fine-tuned network learns a binary classification on the 4k feature representation computed from the AlexNet weights. Table 2 shows how Socratic learning boosted the performance of this pre-trained network by 1.07 points. In this case, the value for DP is not provided since a noise-aware logistic regression model is used as the discriminative model for the NN baseline after the transfer learning step.

5 Conclusion and Future Work

We introduced Socratic learning, a novel framework that can initiate a cooperative dialog between the generative and the discriminative model. We demonstrated how the generative model can be further improved, using feedback from the discriminative model. Finally, we showed how Socratic learning works with relation extraction, crowdsourcing and image classification, where it improved over the best baseline by 0.95, 2.7 and 1.07 points, respectively. We showed how Socratic learning can educate domain experts about the hidden classes in the data that can help them write better heuristics.

For future work, we hope to explore and improve upon the Socratic learning framework. A drawback of the current system is that it relies on the discriminative model learning from some set of interpretable features. With many deep learning applications, the features cannot be easily mapped to some tangible characteristic of the data. These include PLSA/PLSI topic features, which provide high level feedback about what features are important. For images, we could generate patch based features that highlight which part of the image is important in determining labeling functions or workers’ accuracies. Similarly, one can imagine a scenario where the features are too sparse and can hardly provide useful information for the generative model. A potential solution would be to construct a “super” feature by aggregating multiple sparse features. Another possible direction is to look at associative rule-based learning to discover interesting relations among features that can further inform the user about the labeling function design. Since these features also relate to some latent classes in the data, we can look at automatically generating labeling functions.

Acknowledgments Thanks to Alex Ratner, Stephen Bach, Sen Wu, Jason Fries and Theodoros Rekatsinas for their helpful conversations and feedback.

We gratefully acknowledge the support of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) SIMPLEX program under No. N66001-15-C-4043, the National Science Foundation (NSF) CAREER Award under No. IIS- 1353606, the Office of Naval Research (ONR) under awards No. N000141210041 and No. N000141310129, the Sloan Research Fellowship, the Moore Foundation, the Okawa Research Grant, Toshiba, and Intel. Paroma Varma is supported by the the National Science Foundation (NSF) Graduate Research Fellowship under award No. DGE-114747 and the Joseph W. and Hon Mai Goodman Stanford Graduate Fellowship. Rose Yu is supported by the Annenberg Graduate Fellowship. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of DARPA, NSF, ONR, or the U.S. government.

References

- [1] Mark G. Core, H. Chad Lane, Michael van Lent, Dave Gomboc, Steve Solomon, and Milton Rosenberg. Building explainable artificial intelligence systems. In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence - Volume 2, IAAI'06*, pages 1766–1773. AAAI Press, 2006. ISBN 978-1-57735-281-5. URL <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1597122.1597135>.
- [2] Henry R Ehrenberg, Jaeho Shin, Alexander J Ratner, Jason A Fries, and Christopher Ré. Data programming with ddlite: putting humans in a different part of the loop. In *HILDA@ SIGMOD*, page 13, 2016.
- [3] Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. Generative adversarial nets. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2672–2680, 2014.
- [4] Diederik P Kingma, Shakir Mohamed, Danilo Jimenez Rezende, and Max Welling. Semi-supervised learning with deep generative models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3581–3589, 2014.
- [5] Dong-Hyun Lee. Pseudo-label: The simple and efficient semi-supervised learning method for deep neural networks.
- [6] Carlos Guestrin Marco Túlio Ribeiro, Sameer Singh. "why should i trust you?": Explaining the predictions of any classifier. In *KDD*, pages 1135–1144, 2016.
- [7] Mike Mintz, Steven Bills, Rion Snow, and Dan Jurafsky. Distant supervision for relation extraction without labeled data. In *Proceedings of the Joint Conference of the 47th Annual Meeting of the ACL and the 4th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing of the AFNLP: Volume 2- Volume 2*, pages 1003–1011. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2009.
- [8] Maxime Oquab, Leon Bottou, Ivan Laptev, and Josef Sivic. Learning and transferring mid-level image representations using convolutional neural networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1717–1724, 2014.
- [9] Alexander Ratner, Christopher De Sa, Sen Wu, Daniel Selsam, and Christopher Ré. Data programming: Creating large training sets, quickly. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.07723*, 2016.
- [10] Scott E Reed, Honglak Lee, Dragomir Anguelov, Christian Szegedy, Dumitru Erhan, and Andrew Rabinovich. Training deep neural networks on noisy labels with bootstrapping. 2015.
- [11] Sebastian Riedel, Limin Yao, and Andrew McCallum. Modeling relations and their mentions without labeled text. In *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, pages 148–163. Springer, 2010.
- [12] Chih-Hsuan Wei, Yifan Peng, Robert Leaman, Allan Peter Davis, Carolyn J Mattingly, Jiao Li, Thomas C Wieggers, and Zhiyong Lu. Overview of the biocreative v chemical disease relation (cdr) task. In *Proceedings of the fifth BioCreative challenge evaluation workshop*, pages 154–166, 2015.
- [13] Tong Xiao, Tian Xia, Yi Yang, Chang Huang, and Xiaogang Wang. Learning from massive noisy labeled data for image classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 2691–2699, 2015.
- [14] Ce Zhang, Arun Kumar, and Christopher Ré. Materialization optimizations for feature selection workloads. *ACM Transactions on Database Systems (TODS)*, 41(1):2, 2016.
- [15] Xiaojin Zhu. Semi-supervised learning literature survey. 2005.